DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 631 HE 015 604

AUTHOR	Pile, Wilson, Ed.
TITLE	Massachusetts Higher Education in the Eighties: Issues and Tasks. A White Paper. The Alden Seminars.
INSTITUTION	Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts.; Massachusetts Univ., Boston. Center for Studies in Policy and Public Interest.
SPONS AGENCY	Alden (George I.) Trust, Worcester, MA.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	[81]
NOTE	58p.; For related documents, see HE 015 603-605.
AVAILABLE FROM	University of Massachusetts, Center for Studies in Policy and Public Interest, The Library, Harbor Campus, Boston, MA 02125.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; *College Planning; Educational Trends; Enrollment Trends; *Governing Boards; Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; In State Students; Organizational Change; Out of State Students; Position Papers; Public Policy; *Research; School Business Relationship; School Organization; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

A position paper on higher education in Massachusetts in the 1980's which was prepared by the Alden Seminar for Higher Education, is presented. In addition, an overview of the November 1981 Alden Seminar meeting, opening statements, and reports of small groups are included. The Alden Seminar discussions on higher education, especially in regard to Massachusetts, provide the views of Massachusetts business and industrial executives and private and public colleges and universities. Seminar topics included academic standards and the maintenance of quality; the need for public-private higher education planning; and the responsibilities of the Massachusetts Board of Regents. In "Higher Education in Massachusetts in the 1980's: Familiar Issues, Changed Circumstances, New Coalitions," Richard M. Freeland focuses on: Massachusetts's role as a national center for academic research and higher education; progress in assuring access to education in Massachusetts; and prospects for the 1980's with respect to national and local roles of higher education in Massachusetts. Enrollment trends for out-of-state and state residents and data on enrollments at public and private colleges in the state are presented. Information on seminar participants is also included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226631

THE ALDEN SEMINARS

A WHITE PAPER

Massachusetts Higher Education in the Eighties:

Issues and Tasks

University of Massachusetts at Boston
in cooperation with
Association of Independent Colleges and
Universities of Massachusetts

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Univ of Mass at Boston
Center for Public Policy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 015 604

ALDEN SEMINARS

Sponsored by
Association of Independent Colleges
and Universities of Massachusetts
and
The University of Massachusetts-Boston.

Independent and public higher education constitutes a major resource of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and has a very significant total economic impact on the state. Industry is strengthened by this resource and the attributes of its higher education system make Massachusetts an attractive place to live and work. Higher education has entered a dangerous decade characterized by double digit inflation, escalating costs, declining resources, a precipitous decline in the traditional college age population and the absence of rational planning in the public sector.

In recognition of these formidable problems the University of Massachusetts last year sponsored a day long working conference seeking to begin to address the most serious of these issues. The conference was attended by a distinguished group of educational leaders - current and emeriti - from both the private and the public sectors. President Robert O'Neil of the Wisconsin University system, President Jill Conway of Smith College and Dr. John William Ward, former President of Amherst College, spoke to the participants and laid the groundwork for vigorous and spirited discussion. At the end of the day the participants were unanimous in stating that the dialogue begun should not be allowed to die. One and all saw the need for an on-going forum in which influential leaders from business, industry and education might strive to create broad public awareness of these matters of such importance to the state. All agreed that there was a need to throw objective light on the place of higher education in the life of the Commonwealth and on what must be done to safeguard and strengthen it.

In order to create such a forum The Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts and the University of Massachusetts at Boston together applied to the George I. Alden Trust for financial support to organize a series of seminars to be held during 1981-82 in which a group of 20 educational, business and industrial leaders would meet together to discuss substantial position papers dealing with major issues in higher education and to identify possible solutions for problems and areas for action. After each seminar the goal was to publish a "white paper" which could make a contribution to a better informed public and which could be useful to those entrusted with policy formulation. The Alden Trust awarded the grant requested and the first Alden Seminar was held on November 19, 1981. The grantees wish to express their gratitude to the Alden Trust for its generous support. The outreach of The Alden Seminars will be greatly strengthened by an important Ford Foundation grant awarded to the Center for Policy Studies of the University of Massachusetts at Boston which

will permit publication and dissemination of the Alden papers.

Dorothy N. Marshall
Coordinator Alden Seminars

Frank A. Tredinnick, Jr.
Executive Vice President
Association of Independent Colleges
and Universities of Massachusetts

Franklin Patterson
Boyden Professor of the University
University of Massachusetts

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Roster of Participants..... 3

Overview and Outcomes..... 5

Opening Statements..... 10

Position Paper by
Richard Freeland 15

Appendices to
Position Paper..... 42

Reporters' Remarks..... 46

Brief Biographies of
Participants..... 50

PARTICIPANTS

James T. Amsler	President Salem State College
John E. Brooks	President The College of the Holy Cross
John W. Chandler	President Williams College
Robert A. Corrigan	Chancellor University of Massachusetts at Boston
Robert Cushman	Chairman of the Board The Norton Company
Carl Gilbert	President Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts
Avram J. Goldberg	President and Chief Executive Officer The Stop and Shop Companies
George W. Hazzard	Member Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education
Joseph P. Healey	Chairman of the Board Refrigerated Food Express, Inc.
Jacob Hiatt	President Rand-Whitney Corporation
Elizabeth Kennan	President Mount Holyoke College
David C. Knapp	President University of Massachusetts
Roderick M. MacDougall	Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer Bank of New England.

Dorothy Marshall	Coordinator Alden Seminars
Harold T. Miller	Chairman, President, Chief Executive Officer Houghton-Mifflin Company
Coleman M. Mockler, Jr.	Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer The Gillette Company
Franklin K. Patterson	Director, Center for Policy Studies University of Massachusetts at Boston
David B. Perini	Chairman, President, Cnief Executive Officer Perini Corporation
Edward E. Phillips	Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer The New England Mutual Life Insurance Company
Herbert Roth, Jr.	Chairman of the Board and President LFE Corporation
Kenneth G. Ryder	President Northeastern University
Harold E. Shively	President Bunker Hill Community College
Frank A. Tredinnick, Jr.	Executive Vice President Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts
Robert C. Wood	Professor of Political Science University of Massachusetts at Boston

Overview and Outcomes

On Thursday, November 19, 1981, the members of the Alden Seminar met for the afternoon at the University of Massachusetts in Boston. Their purpose, in the first of three sessions during this academic year, was to examine the current situation of higher education with particular reference to Massachusetts. The Alden Seminar participants included chief executives of important business and industrial concerns in the Commonwealth as well as chief executives from a number of private and public colleges and universities.

At the beginning of the afternoon, Seminar members heard introductory statements on conditions in higher education from President Ryder of Northeastern University and Chancellor Corrigan of the University of Massachusetts. Excerpts from these statements are presented as part of this White Paper.

Dr. Richard Freeland of the University of Massachusetts, a historian and student of higher education, then reviewed highlights of the position paper he had prepared for the Seminar, mentioning that drafts of the paper had been read and usefully criticized by Dr. Robert O'Neil, president of the University of Wisconsin System. The Freeland paper and issues it led to were discussed by the Seminar for an hour, with Professor Dorothy Marshall serving as moderator.

The Seminar then divided into three smaller groups for an hour. Their charge was to list and—to the degree possible in the time allowed—to give priority to the major issues, questions, and necessary actions they saw facing higher education in Massachusetts. Each group was chaired by a participant discussion leader, and each had a participant who agreed to summarize the group's discussion in the closing plenary session of the afternoon. The discussion leaders were President Chandler of Williams, President Amsler of Salem State, and President Kennan of Mount Holyoke. The discussion reporters were Avram Goldberg, President, Stop and Shop, Herbert Roth, President of LFE, and Joseph Healey, former chief executive of Baybank Middlesex.

When these reporters had presented their brief summaries to the plenary session in the final hour, the discussion that followed was moderated by Professor Franklin Patterson and focussed on determining whether there were areas of agreement the Seminar could come to with regard to higher education in Massachusetts in the Eighties. Every Seminar member took part in this colloquy, and many individual views were expressed, as had been the case all afternoon. It was apparent, both in the reporters' presentations and in the discussion that ensued, that there was a degree of consensus in the Seminar on a number of points. Certain of these points were stated strongly and repeatedly in various ways, and became evident as principal Seminar concerns.

One of the most central of these concerns, agreement on which appeared unanimous, was articulated by Father Brooks, President of Holy Cross, speaking

both for private and public colleges and universities. He said that:

> "The first task of higher education in Massachusetts is to achieve a credible educational presence with the Legislature."

Much of the discussion in the Seminar touched in one way or another on this formulation, as it affects and involves public and private higher education alike. Substantial consensus developed on a number of other matters. Among these were the following:

1. Quality and Its Perception.

> The development of basic academic/intellectual skills and background during the school years as well as in college work—and the need to assure adequate standards as well as adequate support for this development—constitutes a major critical problem facing all of education, seriously affecting its perception by the public.

This problem, it was asserted requires action within higher education and by higher education in its relations with the secondary and lower schools. For higher education three chief concerns in this regard should be: internal standards, admission standards, and leadership assistance to the schools.

While the Seminar's commentary about quality extended to the whole field of higher education and secondary schooling generally, members of the Seminar repeatedly stressed their view that an "image problem" exists particularly for Massachusetts public colleges and universities, that a basic task for public higher education is to improve public perception of the real quality existing in the sector, and that strong steps should be taken to improve quality where it is not sufficiently high.

2. Planning and Collaboration.

There was a substantial consensus that:

> Widespread readiness exists in the Commonwealth for private-public planning in higher education, perhaps for public-private-business planning, regarding major issues related to higher education, provided a) an appropriate mechanism can be found for such discussions, and b) planning would not be tied to centralized control of private college and university policy decisions.

Closely related to the sentiment for better comprehensive higher education planning in the state was the Seminar's conclusion that:

A need exists for public and private institutions actively to explore the possibility of further collaboration and cooperation in the use of resources and the development of programs and services.

The achievements and shortcomings of present interinstitutional arrangements in the Commonwealth (e.g., Five Colleges, Inc., the Worcester Corsortium for Higher Education, etc) were noted in discussion. So, too, was the need for possible consortial programs to be considered more actively in the Boston area, even though opportunities available may be quite different from those in Worcester and the Five College area. The net outcome of this part of the discussion was that positive experience with existing consortia, and foreseeable conditions in education and the life of the Commonwealth, combine to make it important for colleges and universities of the state to consider further collaboration very seriously.

It was mentioned in discussion that strong public-private collaboration in efforts to improve secondary education would be timely and desirable. Engineering/technical education, and graduate education for residents of the Boston area also were mentioned as possibly useful directions in which private-public collaboration should move, as were cooperation in the development of cable television's educational potentialities and in the cost-effective utilization of newer educational technologies, including computer-assisted instruction.

The Seminar's discussion of collaborative planning and interinstitutional cooperation reflected other basic points of consensus about the relationship of private and public sector colleges and universities in Massachusetts. These were that:

- There is a vital requirement for private and public institutions alike to improve public perception of the fact that higher education of all kinds constitutes a unique major resource in the Commonwealth, irreplaceable in terms of the educational opportunities of students, the state's economy, the quality of life in the state, and its importance in larger affairs.

- There is a unique and mutually beneficial interdependence between private and public higher education in the Commonwealth, an interdependence needing recognition and encouragement, because both sectors are essential to the welfare and advancement of life in the state.

- There is an equivalent need for both sectors working together as well as separately, to make more effective use of the political process to insure that this single, two-sided resource is conserved, improved, and put to the maximum service of students, the state and the country.

3. The Board of Regents: The Requirements of State Responsibility.

Repeatedly in the small groups, in the remarks of all three discussion reporters, and in the closing plenary session on the afternoon of November 19th, the Seminar asserted the critical need for an effective Board of Regents and expressed concern that obstacles to its effectiveness be removed. Representatives of both independent higher education and business/industry spoke to this need and concern emphatically, as did members from public institutions.

There was keen awareness in the Seminar of difficulties the Regents have had in attempting to assume full responsibility for direction of public higher education, in the absence of adequate experience in legislative relations, without adequate budget for staff and operations, without budget authority and fiscal autonomy commensurate with its responsibility, and without freedom from ongoing legislative intervention in policy matters. There was a strong collective readiness in the Seminar, matching its awareness of these difficulties, to advocate development of the Board of Regents as an adequately empowered and supported body.

The following were touched upon in discussion as specifics urgently needed by the Board of Regents:

- Greater understanding and support by the total higher education community in the state.
- Similar understanding and strong support from the business/industrial community.
- A budget for its own staff operations adequate for effective planning and management of academic and fiscal affairs in public higher education in the state.

Seminar members many times expressed their hope that the Board of Regents so strengthened, would play a major role in conserving and enlarging the Commonwealth's total higher education resource. In this connection, the following were touched upon as tangible matters that should benefit from attention by an adequately empowered and properly supported Board of Regents:

- Collaborative state-wide planning with both public and private sector institutions.

- Development and coordination of public-private collaboration in building a jointly-supported data-base/research arm which would undergird higher education planning and policy-making in the Commonwealth.

- Mission clarification and planned diversity of service among public sector institutions and in the total private-public establishment.

- Collaboration with business/industrial community in program and research development relevant to the Commonwealth's economic well-being.

- Representing the importance of the total higher education resource of the state to the public and the General Court.

- Helping Massachusetts become a national leader in providing student access to private higher education as well as to high quality public higher education through the use of state resources.

The discussion that articulated these areas of agreement was spirited and many-sided. But, by the end of Alden Seminar I, it was clear that consensus of the kinds noted above was warmly shared. Participants were convinced that separately and together, public and private higher education have work to do to enhance their effectiveness and image. Participants were agreed as well that state government, in particular the General Court and the Executive, have a great as yet unfulfilled responsibility to recognize the total resource of higher education in the Commonwealth and allow it the protection, support, and institutionalized leadership necessary for it to prosper and serve the state's people and economy as fully as it can.

Alden Seminar II will be held at Henderson House of Northeastern University on Thursday, January 14, 1982, on the topic of Financing and Access in Massachusetts Higher Education. Papers on the topic will be presented by Professor Michael S. McPherson of Williams College and Dean John Maguire of Boston College. Alden Seminar III will occur at the College of the Holy Cross on Thursday, April 22, 1982.

Opening Statements

The first Alden Seminar was held on November 19, 1981 in the Chancellor's Conference Room at the University of Massachusetts at Boston. To establish a frame of reference, the conveners asked President Kenneth G. Ryder of Northeastern University to give an informal recapitulation of the current status and concerns of private higher education and Chancellor Robert A. Corrigan of the University of Massachusetts at Boston to provide the same for public higher education. The following is excerpted from their remarks.

Remarks of President Kenneth C. Ryder

From a parochial point of view, as President of Northeastern, I might say that perhaps I should be concerned about public competition. Northeastern University to some extent serves exactly the same constituency as the public universities and colleges in Massachusetts. When we look at those who are seeking admission to our institution, you find along with Boston University and Boston College, UMass/Amherst is number three as the most popular alternative institution. We look at the undergraduate or graduate sutdent body and we find some 65% of the full-time students are Massachusetts residents. Of those 35,000 part-time students we find at least 90% are Massachusetts residents. So to some extent from a strictly selfish parochial view, I should be desirous of some decline of the public sector. Rising above parochial concerns at this time, however, it seems all of us in higher education are faced with a very substantial common challenge to protect what has developed in the past decades, the public and the private components alike, and to make our system serve the society of which we are a part.

I am quite depressed at what I see happening nationwide. With education no longer recognized as a high national priority, with state legislators reducing funding at the state level for public systems, the federal government ceasing to have a high interest in continued expansion of equal access to education, I think all of the education community must stand together and speak with a unified and firm voice to impress the public and the legislators at the state and federal level of the need to re-think priorities for the nation. The public higher education system and the private higher education system in combination represent one of this nation's greatest resources. An absolute marvel of development has occurred since World War II. Unparalleled in the history of the world, we have put together a higher education establishment able to serve millions of people in high quality programming related to the needs of society. We must not allow this establishment to waste away through neglect or a feeling that it's no longer valuable. On the national level and on the state level I think we need to speak out to point up the importance of education for the future of this country.

Two points at least I think need to be made as we try to turn people's views around. The first is the economic argument. On the state level and on the national level higher education is a vital part of the economic strength of this country. As we seek to develop a national productivity comparable to Germany or Japan, as we try to re-tool American industry and produce higher quality equipment and to produce more efficiently the products of our manufacturing system, we cannot ignore the intellectual, the skill, the professional component that must be joined to that machinery to produce a high level of productivity for our industry. On the local level we are contantly struck with the shortage of skilled manpower needed to sustain the growth of our high technology and related companies in the area. We are part of a rapidly changing technological society that demands ever higher skill for entry level employment and for continued employment, that requires re-training of people at various stages in life to meet the emerging needs of a rapidly changing productive system. Higher education must be viewed as one of the great economic assets of the country and of the region, and it must be allowed to assist in developing this economy to a higher level.

A second feature I think is important to stress as we address the legislators and the public at large, is that we should not focus any longer on the size of high school graduating classes to determine the need for higher education. As never before, our present society requires a broad spectrum of service from higher education to people at all age levels. We have a precious opportunity at this time in history to divert some of the facilities and the talent that we have assembled over the past decades to serve the needs of different age groups as well as those who are graduating from high school. It would be disastrous if we turn away from this opportunity to use the talent and facilities so painfully assembled and not use them for the society which has so many new emerging needs. In Massachusetts, with a third of our state budget going to support welfare and persons who are in effect unable to contribute, there is an apparent and very definite social need for better training, for up-grading, for the skills preparation to allow some of the people in that category to get back to the mainstream of work. As we look to Proposition 2½, and the dislocation of professional people from public payrolls, from the school systems, we see only one part of what is really now in an on-going process—the relocation of adults at various stages in life—to new professions and new careers with a need for skills training. I would have to say to our colleagues in the field of higher education that if we are to turn the attitude of the public and the politicians away from preoccupation with the teenagers, we must, in the higher education community, also recognize the broader purposes which education can serve and not focus specifically upon the traditional student at the beginning of a productive life.

I urge then, that we, in our discussions in the next few months, attempt to gather that consensus that will allow us to speak with a unified voice. Both public and private education in Massachusetts must impress our local publics with the need for strengthening, enriching and improving of the system for broad, social good, and perhaps in the process we can serve as a model for the nation, because our problems are simply a microcosm of what the nation as a whole is facing.

Remarks of Chancellor Robert A. Corrigan

When I returned to Massachusetts after a twenty-five year absence, everybody told me that I was coming back to a challenge. Indeed it is if you are in the public sector at this time. Although I am in the public sector, I am a product of the private sector. This is not atypical. At present there is a great deal of going back and forth between the two, and I believe that it is ironic that those who most often try to forge a link between the sectors often share similar private sector backgrounds. From the point of view of the public sector, what is happening in Massachusetts is, in a sense, a microcosm, an exemplum, of what is going on across the country now.

The first public sector issue that comes to mind is that of finance. Massachusetts has an international reputation for the quality of its education. Despite the preeminence of the private institutions, a look at the public sector shows we rank forty-ninth or fiftieth in our per capita support of public higher education. I heard the President of the University of Chicago complaining that she had only three hundred thirty million dollars to run her University. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is running thirty campuses this year on that same budget.

It is important that people, particularly representatives from business, become concerned over the financing of higher education now. Increasingly the middle class, even the upper middle class, is finding itself making very hard choices on where to send their children. In part due to federal policy, in part to state and local policies, a current phenomenom is the extent to which people who were educated privately cannot afford to educate all their children in the private sector. If people who historically would have used the private sector are turning to the public sector, it shows that they must feel reasonably assured of the quality of the educational experience available to them. Without being overly critical of the public sector, I would suggest that Massachusetts needs to do a good deal to improve the quality of public higher education in this Commonwealth if we are going to serve the citizenry properly. The best talent, the best resource that Massachusetts has is our young people, people who through the education they receive, serve the needs of the state. If Massachusetts were to lose its high technology industry, its computer industry, we are all indeed in trouble. The private sector alone cannot provide the people needed to staff these industries.

Another central issue is demographics. We cannot simply look at the number of eighteen to twenty-two year olds. Figures I've seen suggest that by the end of the century there will be forty-two percent fewer high school graduates than there were in the peak years of 1979 and 1980. There will be fewer, but that factor is not as critical to the public sector as one might think, Northeastern in the private and the University of Massachusetts at Boston in the public are interestingly alike in one particular regard—the median age of our students is now twenty-seven. At our College of Public and Community Service the median age is thirty-five. I suspect that the median age statistic at Bunker Hill Community College is not too dissimilar to this University. The

public sector institutions are not serving the traditional eighteen to twenty-two year old cohort to the extent that they did in the recent past.

"Quality", "standards", and the rest of the jargon used with regard to accessibility to and the caliber of higher education is another pervasive issue. The public university is constantly assailed, on the one hand, by forces who maintain that public higher education must be completely open—without regard to admissions standards, it should serve all, no matter their background—and, on the other hand, by those who feel that standards are not what they should be. A popular current epithet is "elitist". Public higher education must be concerned over the credibility of the degrees it awards. I believe that access to a university brings with it responsibility—responsibility for the individual to live up to the qualitative standards of the institution, and responsibility for the institution to provide support—student support and academic support—so that the individual who graduates will, in fact, be able to function in our society.

Reorganization is a constant concern, although it has also become a way of life. At a recent American Council on Education meeting I encountered an old acquaintance who had taught at Smith College in 1947. He told me that the big higher education issue back then was the proposed restructuring of the University of Massachusetts. Although it has become a way of life, it is not conducive to substantial long-range planning or stability. It should be noted that the university is never static—it is constantly redefining itself, restructuring itself, or moving into different areas. Vocational orientation versus the preeminence of the liberal arts, the definition of the real needs of the student and of the economy—these are other issues affecting the public sector and perhaps worthy of study by this seminar.

The item which concerns me the most, however, and, perhaps, that item which most clearly differentiates the public sector from the private sector, is the extent to which nationally, not just in Massachusetts, interference in the decision-making process is on the increase in public institutions on the part of legislative or executive personnel. Interference comes in the guise of seeking economies, of saving money, or of making the public sector more responsible or accountable. We are seeing, not just in this state but in practically every state in the union, extraordinary intrusions into the decision-making process. One of the great battles of the fifties was the one to gain fiscal autonomy for public higher education. This battle led to the resignation of one University of Massachusetts President, which, in turn, led to a state-wide campaign to assure fiscal autonomy for public higher education. Fiscal autonomy was taken away in the last budget. Salaries paid at the University are now subject to public debate on the floor of the Senate or the House. This is a major intrusion into the rights colleges and universities have traditionally enjoyed. People in state government are now making decisions about public higher education that are more properly made by the people who were in fact hired to make them.

Finally, I join with President Ryder in saying that I have never understood the tensions between the private sector and the public sector. Demographic reasons suggest there will be more tension in the not too distant

future. I believe it desirable and necessary for the public sector that we maintain a private sector of high quality. I consider it equally important to the private sector that public education is of high quality. The private sector is not helped by a third-rate public university. In the days, weeks, and years to come, we must work together on these problems of mutual concern.

Position Paper

Higher Education in Massachusetts in the 1980's: Familiar Issues, Changed Circumstances, New Coalitions

Richard M. Freeland

The Alden Seminars in
Higher Education

Co-Sponsored by the
University of Massachusetts
and
The Association of Independent
Colleges and Universities of
Massachusetts

Boston, Massachusetts
November, 1981

Preface

This paper has been prepared as a basis for discussion during the Alden Seminars, to be held at the University of Massachusetts, Northeastern University, and Holy Cross College during 1981-82. The Seminars, sponsored by the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts and the University of Massachusetts at Boston, will be a series of discussions among leaders of business and education to explore common concerns related to higher education in Massachusetts. The author would like to thank Dr. Dorothy Marshall, Coordinator of the Alden Seminars, and Dr. Franklin Patterson, Director of the Center for Studies in Policy and the Public Interest at UMass/Boston, for the opportunity to undertake this project. I especially wish to acknowledge the assistance of Ms. Janet Bailey of the Massachusetts Board of Regents and Mr. James True of the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts. Dr. Robert O'Neil, President of the University of Wisconsin, discussed the paper with me in a helpful way at each stage of its development. None of these persons, of course, is in any way responsible for the contents of the paper.

Richard M. Freeland

Introduction

These are difficult times for institutions of higher education, across the country and in Massachusetts. During the 1970s educators worried about potential enrollment declines and lower levels of funding, but the reality of the decade for most colleges and universities was relatively modest adjustments to diminished rates of expansion. In the early 1980s, however, American academic institutions face the most serious financial and political problems they have encountered since World War II. The long-anticipated decline in the number of young people of college-going age—the source of so much concern during the 1970s— finally is arriving. Leaders of many independent institutions, having solved the financial problems of the 1970s through increased tuition and expanded enrollments, must face continued inflation of costs with limited possibilities for raising prices or adding students, combined with reduced assistance from outside sources, especially the federal government. Officials at public institutions must contend with eroded political support exacerbated in many states by economic difficulties and broad-based sentiment for decreasing the scale of governmental activities.

The circumstances that are creating problems for higher education nationally tend to be even more severe in Massachusetts. The operating costs of independent institutions are higher here than in other regions. Financial support for public higher education fell more sharply in Massachusetts than in many other states in the middle 1970s, and the recent passage of Proposition 2½ has forced the state to accept one of the most stringent cost cutting programs in the nation. The anticipated decline of 18-24 year olds is projected to be far greater in Massachusetts than in the country generally: between 1981 and 1990 annual graduates of Massachusetts public high schools are projected to decline by 32%, compared to 19% nationally. One positive element in Massachusetts is the current strength of the state's economy, based on the recent success of high technology industries; but residents of Massachusetts are also afflicted by economic pressures at least as burdensome as those of other regions, and these pressures reduce the ability to meet tuition costs at independent institutions as well as the willingness to pay taxes to support public education.

The prospect of troubled times for institutions of higher education can have major implications for the general welfare of the Commonwealth. Much that is distinctive and dynamic in the cultural, political, and social life of the state depends directly on the vitality of our colleges and universities. The presence in Massachusetts of an international center for medical research and practice reflects the strength of our university-based medical schools. In no other state do educational institutions play as large an economic role as they do in Massachusetts, where higher education constitutes a major industry in itself as well

as an important source of ideas and personnel for private enterprise. The current strength of our high technology industries derives in large part from links to academic institutions, and Massachusetts leads the nation in its dependence on technology-based industries to employ its citizens. The current situation in higher education must be a matter of concern to business and civic leaders as well as to educators.

Difficult times present opportunities as well as problems. The Alden Seminars constitute an invitation to leaders of higher education, from both the independent and public sectors, and the business community to seek constructive possibilities in the difficult circumstances that confront our colleges and universities. No one can doubt that these circumstances will produce intense competition—some of it healthy—among educational institution. It may also be possible, however, to minimize destructive rivalry and even to discover in current problems a new basis for cooperation in strengthening higher education in Massachusetts. This is the challenge and hope of the Alden Seminars.

This paper has been prepared for the first of the Seminars. Subsequent sessions will focus on specific problems, including the role of higher education in producing trained personnel for local industry and alternative approaches to student financial aid. This essay focuses on three general questions that seem appropriate points of departure for a discussion of higher education in the decade ahead:

- How healthy is the state's role as a national center for academic research and higher education?
- How well is Massachusetts doing in assuring its citizens access to a reasonable array of educational opportunities?
- What opportunities and dangers can be anticipated in the 1980s with respect to both the national and local roles of higher education in Massachusetts?

The following pages, constituting Part I of the paper, contain summary assessments of the state's position with respect to each of these questions and also outline possible responses and courses of action; Part I is intended as a focus for discussion at the Seminar. Part II of the paper provides more detailed analyses of the issues summarized in Part I. A brief, descriptive overview of higher education in Massachusetts is provided in an Appendix.

The participants in the Alden Seminars are experienced men and women, knowledgeable about higher education and the affairs of Massachusetts. This paper does not attempt to prescribe solutions to current problems. It's goal, rather, is to identify issues and to suggest possibilities that will provoke useful discussions among the participants in the Seminars and in the wider community with which the results of these proceedings will be shared.

Part I: SUMMARY ANALYSES AND QUESTIONS FOR THE SEMINAR

A. Summary Analysis of Four Issues

1. *On the position of Massachusetts as a national research center:*

The position of national leadership in academic research established by colleges and universities in Massachusetts following World War II is one of the state's most precious assets. Over the past fifteen years our institutions of higher education, independent and public, have compiled an impressive record in maintaining the state's position, as measured by the success of these institutions in attracting financial support for research from federal and corporate sources. There are, however, some indications—offered here only as warning signs, not definitive findings—that the state's position has been slipping.

Total research expenditures by colleges and universities in Massachusetts in the 1970s represented a smaller percentage of national expenditures for this purpose than in the 1960s; federal research funds attracted by our institutions declined as a percentage of total federal support between the 1960s and 1970s; since 1970 we have attracted a declining percentage of the nation's corporate contributions to support academic research. As we enter a period in which corporate support for research is assuming increased importance, our colleges and universities appear to be relatively less successful in obtaining assistance from business and industry than from the federal government. These trends—which need to be confirmed by more refined analysis—represent modest and not dramatic change, but, if continued over an extended period, they raise the possibility of serious erosion of the state's position as a national research center. No public agency or association of institutions is monitoring the collective success of our academic institutions in attracting financial support for research.

(For a more detailed discussion, see pp 8 to 15)

2. *On the role of Massachusetts as a national education center:*

The success of the state's colleges and universities in attracting out-of-state students is almost as important to Massachusetts as success in attracting research support; out-of-state enrollments play a vital role in maintaining our independent institutions financially and in attracting both dollars and talent to the state in large quantities. In recent years the overall number of out-of-state students in our colleges and universities has increased; our leading, national institutions have maintained their attractiveness, and a number of other institutions, previously oriented toward Massachusetts, have repositioned themselves in regional or national markets. There are indications that a slightly increasing percentage of the nation's young people are interested in attending college in Massachusetts.

Despite these positive signs, since 1968 our independent institutions have enrolled collectively progressively larger percentages of their students from within the state. The percentage of out-of-state students in

our public institutions, while never large, also has declined in recent years. With the numbers of traditional college-aged persons about to drop precipitously in Massachusetts the pattern of increased aggregate dependence on local residents implies serious difficulties. Our leading institutions will undoubtedly be able to maintain their positions, but other institutions are vulnerable and the potential for destructive competition, within and between the public and independent sectors, is great.

(For a more detailed discussion, see pp 15-18)

3. *On the record of Massachusetts in educating its own residents:*

While Massachusetts traditionally has played a leading role in educating the nation's young people, the state's record of supporting higher education for its own residents has not been outstanding. During the 1960s, however, in response to overwhelming demand for college admission from an unusually large youth group in the population, the state's system of public institutions was rapidly expanded. Since the mid 1970s the state also has been enlarging its program of scholarships to support attendance at independent or public institutions. A recent analysis of educational opportunity in Massachusetts conducted by the Sloan Commission concluded that developments during the past fifteen years, especially the expansion of the public sector, have provided state residents from all income groups with reasonable access to some form of higher education. There is a tendency now, with enrollments expected to decline, to assume that the problem of assuring access has been met. In recent years the state has been reducing its effort in higher education compared to other state-supported activities.

Although the gains of the 1970s were substantial, some troubling facts about educational patterns in Massachusetts must be considered. The state currently ranks well below the national average in terms of the proportion of our own citizens educated within our borders. We also appear to rank below the national average, at almost every income level, in the percentage of our dependent 18-24 year olds who attend any form of college. The Sloan Commission, while finding that most residents have access to some form of higher education, emphasized the highly restricted choice of institutions available to many citizens. Our public expenditures per capita on higher education and per FTE student in public institutions remain near the bottom among the states, and recent cutbacks have lost some of the ground gained in relation to other states in the 60s. Despite the recent expansion of the state's scholarship program, in 1980 Massachusetts ranked only 16th in state expenditures per capita for scholarships; in 1973 we ranked 11th. The current reductions in public support for higher education are coming in the context of a massive lack of information about the Commonwealth's likely needs for educational facilities in the years ahead; no reliable projections of enrollment demand exist and there is no capacity in place to make such projections.

(For a more detailed discussion see pp 18 to 21)

4. *On the organization of the state's system of higher education:*

Since 1965 repeated efforts have been made to create a coherent organization of the state's educational institutions, public and independent, in order to assure the most efficient use of public resources to support educational activities. Initiatives to define the roles of the public and independent sectors through collaborative planning achieved some gains in the mid 1970s, but ultimately broke down when neither side was ready seriously to adjust institutional agendas. Within the public sector there were a series of efforts from the middle 1960s to the late 1970s to establish rational conceptions of the missions of the various community colleges, state colleges, and universities. All of these efforts, however, were so buffeted by institutional as well as conventional politics that none succeeded in creating an authority capable of imposing order. Finally, in 1980, in a series of rapid moves connected with the budget process and without public discussion, the Legislature abolished all existing supra-institutional governing authorities and created a single Board of Regents with statutory power to create a coherent system of public institutions.

The Regents are now beginning a new effort to develop a comprehensive plan for public higher education in Massachusetts. Indications, summarized above, that the task of assuring educational opportunity for state residents is far from complete underscore the importance of this effort. Can the Regents succeed where so many previous attempts have failed? Despite their statutory authority, the early history of the Regents is not encouraging. The Legislature has failed to provide the new Board with adequate resources and has attempted in several instances, some successful, to reorganize public higher education through the budget process. The whole history of the Regents, in fact—including the way in which the Board was created—tends to reflect the political weakness of public higher education in Massachusetts and that weakness leaves the new governing authority with a minimum basis to protect our institutions from precipitous and destructive political intervention. Moreover, the new organization is confined to the public sector and has no mechanism for creating a comprehensive system including both public and independent institutions. The Regents, their Chancellor and his staff are to be admired for their efforts as well as supported, but it is hard to be hopeful about their prospects unless they can achieve more effective, broader-based political support.

(For a more detailed discussion see pp 21-25)

The overall pattern of change in higher education in Massachusetts during the past fifteen years contains much basis for pride and optimism. We have a strong institutional base, in both the independent and public sectors, through which the concerns identified in the preceding paragraphs can be addressed. One basic message of this paper is that Massachusetts can continue to play a leading national role in higher education and also to make progress in providing educational opportunities for state residents; a second message is that nothing guarantees our success in either of these endeavors. We need effective planning by institutional leaders for the

predictable difficulties of the 1980s. We also need—perhaps more clearly than anything else at the moment—enlightened educational policies by the political leaders of the state. The time for both kinds of leadership is now.

B. The Possibility of New Coalitions

A central purpose of the Alden Seminars is to consider whether collaborative action by educational and business leaders can be helpful in fostering the institutional and public policy responses needed to face the problems of the 1980s. In considering a collaborative approach to current issues, it is important to keep in mind the results of past efforts at inter-institutional cooperation, in Massachusetts and around the country. Such efforts have not eliminated rivalry among institutions and have tended to be effective only in addressing problems at the margins of institutional concern. It is also clear, however, that useful things can happen at the margins of institutional activity and that collaborative action can produce effective public advocacy without directly affecting institutional operation. There are several reasons to believe that the present position of higher education in Massachusetts contains opportunities for new and potentially important forms of collaborative action.

- The costs to Massachusetts of failing to maintain our strong national role in higher education are potentially very great. The increasing importance of high technology in the state's economy has made clearer than ever the links between the prosperity of the Commonwealth and our academic institutions. Nor is this solely an economic issue. All of our academic institutions profit from the general strength of the Massachusetts educational community; it is immensely helpful in attracting students, faculty, and financial support. Keeping higher education strong at a time when both the state's economic base and the position of our colleges and universities are far from secure must be a priority that transcends the interests of particular institutions and engages the concern of business leaders as well as educators. Perhaps the unproductive rivalries that frequently have blocked progress in higher education during the past fifteen years can be moderated in the face of larger state concerns in the 1980s.

- Leaders of independent institutions in Massachusetts can see, much more clearly than five or ten years ago, that the Commonwealth contains extremely limited potential to solve their problems. The increasing aggregate dependence of independent institutions on local residents represents a pattern that can only lead to trouble for a number of institutions in the context

of the demographic changes expected in the state. The pattern of declining state support for public higher education dramatizes the limited financial resources of Massachusetts. Several independent institutions once inclined to turn to the state for solutions to their financial problems, have in recent years successfully established positions in national and regional markets and in so doing have strengthened both themselves and higher education generally. This pattern must be followed by other independent institutions. Public policies that help independent institutions attract students to Massachusetts are in everyone's interest and here both public educators and business leaders can assist and support the independent institutions.

Leaders of public institutions can see, much more clearly than five or ten years ago, that Massachusetts will not soon create a public sector comparable to the major state systems of the country, however appealing that development might be in the abstract, and however possible it might have seemed in the 1960s. Public higher education has been well-supported in Massachusetts only twice since World War II—the late 1940s and the 1960s—both periods of explosive expansion of public demand for access to college; such times will not come soon again. The major challenge for public higher education over the next several years will be to avoid steady deterioration of the gains of the 1960s and to continue progress toward the goals of quality and access within the financial and political constraints so clearly present in the state. We need new conceptions of quality as well as access in public higher education and the most evident possibilities involve inventive forms of public-independent collaboration. New public-independent coalitions, strengthened by close ties to business, can provide public educators with enhanced support in pursuing adequate levels of funding, assistance that will be sorely needed in the years ahead.

C. Questions for the Alden Seminar

If circumstances are present that make collaborative action involving public and independent higher education and business more feasible today than five or ten years ago, some possible areas for such action, growing out of the four issues discussed above, can be identified.

1. *With respect to the state's role as a national research center:*

   Assuming that colleges and universities in Massachusetts are attracting a declining proportion of the nation's research dollars, as suggested by a preliminary review of available data, how serious a concern is this? Does the importance of academic research to the state justify a more refined—perhaps collaboratively sponsored—effort to analyze the state's position in this area.

   It appears that no public agency or institutional association regularly assembles data on the collective success of the state's academic institutions in attracting research support. How important is such information? Does it make sense for this function to be adopted by some existing entity or assigned to a new unit established for this purpose.

   Does it make sense to consider collective action, perhaps involving academic, business and civic leaders, to promote and protect the state's position as a national center for academic research? For example, could new structures linking several institutions with limited research facilities create an enhanced capacity to attract research support in particular academic fields?

   Apart from Harvard and MIT, no Massachusetts institution appears to have a successful program to attract corporate contributions to support academic research; it is not clear from readily available information how collectively successful our institutions are in attracting R&D contracts from industry. Can academic and business leaders work together to assure maximum success of the state's academic institutions in attracting corporate research support?

2. *With respect to the state's position as a national education center:*

   Given the relatively secure national positions of our leading institutions, how concerned should the state's leaders be about the aggregate vulnerability of our independent institutions to forseeable enrollment problems? How large a state interest is there in maintaining the viability of second and third level institutions that may be threatened in the years ahead?

3. *With respect to programs for educating Massachusetts residents:*

- How significant a state interest is there—from the perspective, for example, of the business community—in assuring a strong program of educational opportunity for state residents from all income groups? What role do business leaders see for publicly supported institutions in linking educational programs with the state's economic development? Are business leaders ready to support well conceived plans for strengthening the state's record in providing educational opportunities for its citizens?

- Massachusetts has only a modest record of establishing public policies designed to make use of the state's independent institutions. Are public sector educators prepared to support more imaginative ways of making independent institutions accessible to state residents as part of an overall effort in which independent institutions provide organized political support for the development of public higher education within a negotiated conception of public-independent relationships?

- Every serious study of public higher education in Massachusetts in recent years has deplored the absence of reliable information on the state's educational needs and activities; is it possible to imagine a collaboratively supported data collection and research capability, paralleling the National Center for Education Statistics, that could provide educators from all types of institutions with accurate statistical information relevant to educational planning?

4. *With respect to the organization of public higher education:*

- Can three elements: a willingness on the part of public leaders to support public policies helpful to independent institutions; a readiness among independent institutions to provide organized political support for public higher education; the interest of the business community in assuring a strong system of public higher education, provide the basis for a collaboratively conceived system of ed cational opportunity in Massachusetts that links public and independent higher education in new and expanded ways?

- Would the efforts of the Regents to develop a new Master Plan for higher education in Massachusetts be helped by greater involvement and support of independent institutions and business leaders?

These are only a few possibilities for collaborative action in response to the problems of the 1980s. Additional ideas will be generated by the participants in the Alden Seminars and by other persons who review the results of these discussions. We need as many ideas as we can get, and we need to find a means for following through on the best of them. Failure to fully explore existing possibilities for collaborative action could lead, in the circumstances of the 1980s, to forms of competition that will be destructive to colleges and universities as well as to the Commonwealth.

Part II: FURTHER ANALYSIS OF MAJOR ISSUES

D. Massachusetts as a National Research Center

Massachusetts prides itself on being a national leader in academic research. The state includes two internationally prominent research universities, whose talented scholars account for a remarkable portion of the country's intellectual achievements, and a number of other colleges and universities, less famous than Harvard or MIT, which include departments and individuals of major reputations and accomplishments. This unusual concentration of research capacity is not just an appealing quality of Massachusetts; it is essential to the well-being of the state. The resurgence of the Massachusetts economy after World War II, symbolized by the development of Route 128, resulted more clearly from the research productivity of the Boston academic community, particularly of MIT, than from any other factor. The more recent strengthening of the state's economy through the growth of high technology industries, so closely linked to academic research laboratories, is a further evidence of the state's economic reliance on its colleges and universities. In 1979 33% of the Massachusetts labor force was employed in high technology industries, making the Commonwealth more dependent economically on this type of enterprise, by a substantial margin, than any other state in the union.

Citizens of Massachusetts are so accustomed to the presence of our leading academic centers that it is easy to forget how recently our national prominence in academic research was achieved. Before World War II MIT was essentially an undergraduate engineering school whose leaders were struggling, with only marginal success, to create a strong program of scientific research. Harvard in the pre-war years remained closer to its past emphasis on classical and humanistic studies than its current commitment to advanced, specialized research. Tufts, Boston University, the University of Massachusetts and Brandeis have all achieved their current strong roles in academic research within the past twenty-five years. The relatively short history of Massachusetts as a national research center should remind us that the state's position in this respect is not invulnerable to challenge. Much of the remarkable postwar blossoming of research in our universities occurred during years when educational institutions in other parts of the country were much less developed than in Massachusetts, a situation that is no longer true. For much of the postwar period, for example, national science policy was dominated by men from MIT and Harvard, a fact not unrelated to the immense success of these two institutions in attracting federal research support in the early postwar years; despite the continuing strength of Harvard and MIT, this kind of domination by local—or northeastern—institutions is inconceivable today. We must be sure that our conception of our national role in academic research is informed by continuous attention to current facts.

How strong is the state's position as a national center for academic research? There are many ways to think about this question, and answering it in a satisfactory way is beyond the scope of this paper. One important

indicator of our situation, however, is our relative level of expenditure for research and especially our capacity to attract outside support, since so much of academic work is based on non-institutional funds. Some basic information with respect to the state's record of financial expenditure for academic research can be obtained from surveys conducted regularly since the 1960s by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), the National Science Foundation (NSF), and the Council for Financial Aid to Higher Education (CFAHE). Relevent information from these surveys is summarized in Table 1 (page 29). It should be emphasized that neither the data in Table 1, nor the analysis to which this information has been subjected, sustain more than preliminary impressions. Nonetheless, this information makes it clear that colleges and universities in Massachusetts have compiled an impressive record over the past fifteen years. In particular:

- Massachusetts has maintained a steady position, behind California and New York, in terms of both overall expenditures for research by colleges and universities and success in attracting federal research support.

- Harvard and MIT, in their own class locally, have maintained positions in the top ten institutions nationally in attracting federal support, and MIT typically has been the national leader—by a wide margin—in this respect.

- Two Massachusetts institutions, Boston University and UMass/Amherst, which only recently have become research centers, have advanced steadily in national rankings in terms of federal research support.

- In recent years, as federal research support has declined, Harvard and MIT, particularly the latter, have played leading roles nationally in winning increased corporate support for research.

These facts make it clear that academic research among the leading colleges and universities in Massachusetts is a healthy and dynamic enterprise. A more detailed analysis would show important activities going on at a number of other institutions.

TABLE I

Financial Support for Academic Research
in Massachusetts Colleges and Universities
as Percent of National Totals

1963 - 1980

	Expenditures for Separately-Budgeted Research[1].	Federal Obligations for Research and Development[2].	Corporate Contributions for Academic Research[3].
1963	-	10.6	-
1966	8.4	8.7	5.3
1969	-	11.3	-
1970	8.7	11.3	9.9
1972	-	10.8	-
1973	5.8	-	-
1975	6.0	7.8	6.1
1976	6.2	-	-
1978	6.2	8.0	-
1980	-	-	5.9

---

1. Compiled from Financial Statistics of Higher Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

2. Compiled from Federal Support to Universities, Colleges, & Selected Non-Profit Institutions, National Science Foundation.

3. Data supplied by Council for Financial Aid to Higher Education.

Despite the recent success of the Massachusetts academic community in maintaining competitive levels of expenditure for research, there appear to be some negative indications that merit careful consideration. Several items are especially striking:

- During the 1960s colleges and universities in Massachusetts accounted for 8% to 9% of all separately-budgeted academic research done nationally; during the 1970s the figure has slipped to around 6%.

- During the 1960s our academic institutions regularly attracted 9% to 11% of federal funds for research and development awarded to academic institutions; in recent years the numbers have slipped to 7% to 8%.

- Since 1970 Massachusetts academic institutions have attracted a steadily declining percentage of corporate contributions to support academic research among colleges and universities responding to the CFAHE survey. There is no central source of information on our success in winning corporate contracts for research and development projects.

The declines cited above are not dramatic in scale and they are based only on the kind of preliminary analysis possible for a paper of this type. They are, moreover, relative, not absolute; they should not be interpreted as meaning that our research expenditures have declined in recent years, which they have not, although inflation has consumed much of the expansion. Some relative slippage, moreover, is almost certainly inevitable, as other regions of the country are growing much more rapidly than Massachusetts in every way. Still, academic research is so fundamental to the state that indicators of potential erosion of our national position must be a cause of concern to our academic, business and civic leaders. A slippage of 2 percentage points in a decade when the starting point is only 9% or 10% can lead, if maintained, to a major decline in the state's position in a relatively short period.

Some other facts about support for academic research in Massachusetts are worth noting:

- For every year in which data is available for both federal and corporate support, our academic institutions have done relatively better with respect to federal aid; this suggests a particular kind of vulnerability in our position, as we move into a period in which corporate support has increased in importance.

- While Harvard and MIT have done very well in attracting increased corporate contributions for academic research—as distinct from corporate R&D contracts—the same cannot be said about other research-oriented institutions in Massachusetts, if the CFAHE data are accurate. While Harvard and MIT have played a dominant but declining role in attracting federal support in recent years—from about 80% of federal dollars coming to Massachusetts in the mid 1960s to about 68% in the late 1970s—they have played a far larger role in attracting corporate support, accounting for not less than 88% in any year tabulated and less than 95% in only one such year; in short, much of the recent progress in research activities by our colleges and universities has been tied—exclusively—to federal support, a source that seems more uncertain now than fifteen years ago.

It must be re-emphasized that the data and analysis presented in the preceding pages are highly tentative. The question for the Alden Seminars is whether such readily available data suggest sufficiently serious question to prompt more extensive analysis.

E. Massachusetts as a National Education Center

The state's role as a national center for higher education is much older than our prominence in academic research, in large part because the whole phenomenon of academic research in the modern sense is so largely a post World War II phenomenon in the United States. Harvard and Radcliffe, MIT, Wellesley, Smith, Holyoke, Amherst and Williams were all attracting students on a national basis before World War II. During the past 25 years institutions that once devoted themselves mainly or exclusively to educating residents of Massachusetts—Boston University, Boston College, Tufts, Northeastern, to mention a few leading examples--have also been able to attract out-of-state students in large numbers. The evolution of this latter group of institutions into regional or national institutions was intially achieved during the 1960s, when demand for college admission was expanding more rapidly than the capability of the nation's colleges to absorb it. Even Harvard and MIT became far more national in their oreintations after World War II than they had been before. The student markets that enabled these institutions to transform themselves so dramatically are now gone, not soon to return. The focus of attention now is on declining demand for admission from students of traditional college-going ages. In this new context, how strong is our role as a national center for higher education?

The best available sources of information on the ability of the state's colleges and universities to attract out-of-state students are the migration studies of the National Center for Educational Statistics. Relevant information from these surveys is summarized in Table II (page 32).

Table II

Massachusetts, New England, & Non-New England
Enrollments at Massachusetts Colleges and Universities

1968 - 1979*

All Colleges and Universities

	Total Enrollment	From Massachusetts	Non New England	Non New England	Total Out-of-State
1968	240,528	160,281(66.6%)	21,803(9.1%)	58,444(24.3%)	80,247(33.4%)
1975	367,155	269,468(73.4%)	26,372(7.2%)	71,315(19.4%)	97,687(26.6%)
1979	149,527	114,115(76.3%)	10,678(7.1%)	24,734(16.5%)	35,412(23.7%)
			Independent Colleges and Universities		
1968	172,532	96,507(55.9%)	20,457(11.9%)	55,568(32.2%)	76,025(44.1%)
1975	207,278	122,093(58.9%)	20,975(10.1%)	64,210(31.0%)	85,185(41.1%)
1979	81,983	50,354(61.4%)	-	-	31,629(38.6%)
			Public Colleges and Universities		
1968	67,996	63,774(93.8%)	1,346(2.0%)	2,876(4.2%)	4,222(6.2%)
1975	159,877	147,375(92.2%)	5,397(3.4%)	7,105(4.4%)	12,502(7.8%)
1979	67,544	63,761(94.4$)	-	-	3,783(5.6%)

*Compiled from Migration of College Students, National Center for Education Statistics.
Note: Data for 1968 & 1975 refer to all students; data for 1979 refer to new students.

The migration studies are limited by the fact that they provide only general information and, in recent years, the format for data collection has changed, making the establishment of trends problematic. A second source of information is the College Board, which keeps track of institutions to which students send their scores on Scholastic Aptitude Tests to seek college admission. While the student migration and College Board data provide only preliminary indications of the state's ability to attract out-of-state students, some reasonable impressions can be formed.

In general the attractiveness of our colleges and universities to students from outside Massachusetts has remained consistently strong in recent years. Specifically:

- Between 1968 and 1979 Massachusetts has attracted a steadily growing number of out-of-state students to its academic institutions.*

- In 1979 Massachusetts ranked second highest, after Ohio, among major industrial states in percentage of out-of-state students in the total enrollment of its colleges and universities.

- In 1979 Massachusetts ranked third (behind California and New York) among all states in the absolute number of out-of-state students attracted to its colleges and universities; we also ranked third (behind California and Texas) in net in-migration of students (in-migrants minus state residents leaving the state to attend college elsewhere.)

- In recent years slightly increasing percentages of students taking the Scholastic Aptitude Tests—between 11% and 13%—have indicated an interest in attending college in Massachusetts.

Despite these positive signs, there are some trends to be concerned about with respect to student migration statistics:

- Other New England and non-New England residents have constituted a steadily declining percentage of our overall enrollments since 1968.

- While some of the decline in the relative role of out-of-state students is attributable to the expansion of public higher education in Massachusetts, our independent colleges and universities also have enrolled a declining proportion of out-of-state students over the past thirteen years.

*This statement involves an inference, since migration data for 1979 cover only students enrolling for the first time at a given level in a given institution, while data for earlier years covered all students.

- Public institutions expanded their relative proportions of out-of-state students between 1968 and 1975, but this pattern was reversed between 1975 and 1979, when the out-of-state percentage fell below the 1968 level.

- As the proportion of young persons in the population declines, many colleges and universities are placing increased emphasis on attracting "non-traditional students"—older persons, women returning to the workforce, students currently employed. Such students are likely to attend college on a part-time rather than full-time basis and are much less likely than traditional students to travel out of state for their studies. As non-traditional students become an increasing percentage of the overall student population, colleges and universities in Massachusetts may be turning more and more to local residents to fill their classes.

The increased aggregate dependence of our colleges and universities, especially our independent ones, on local residents to maintain enrollment levels is a disturbing element of the state's educational picture, especially in the context of the demographic changes projected for the 1980s. These demographic changes have concerned educators for a decade, but only now are we actually confronting them. Our current situation appears to contain the potential for severe inter-institutional competition as well as increased tension between public and private sectors.

F. Educational Opportunities for State Residents

Despite the state's national reputation for educational leadership, Massachusetts government traditionally has lagged behind other states in supporting educational opportunities for local residents. With so many independent institutions located here—almost all of them, until recently, mainly concerned with enrolling students from Massachusetts—the need for a large public sector in higher education was much reduced. Prior to 1960 in fact, higher education in Massachusetts chiefly involved a strong private sector meeting most of the state's needs in an uncoordinated but reasonably effective way. Although large numbers of Massachusetts residents traditionally left the state to obtain education elsewhere, many in public institutions supported by other states, and although public sector educators and some political leaders repeatedly drew attention to the state's failure to provide educational opportunities for residents with moderate incomes, public higher education was chronically unable to achieve more than a marginal role in the state's overall educational system.

Beginning around 1960 the state's traditional apathy toward public higher education began to change in dramatic ways. The driving force for this was the "baby boom" of the postwar years. Independent institutions found themselves unable to absorb the numbers of students suddenly seeking

admission, and the most important of them were more eager to use the period of expanding demand to turn themselves into regional or national institutions than to accommodate more local residents. About the same time the Democrats, philosophically oriented toward public education, gained control of the Massachusetts legislature for the first time. A commission was established to review the state's educational needs under the leadership of Senator Kevin Harrington and an educator named Benjamin Willis; the Willis-Harrington Report urged a sympathetic legislature to undertake the rapid expansion of public higher education. For the first time state revenues began to flow into public educational institutions in large amounts.

Between the early 1960s and the late 1970s a fifteen-campus community college system was created; existing state teachers colleges were expanded into comprehensive four-year institutions; the University of Massachusetts grew rapidly at Amherst and opened new campuses in Boston and Worcester; new regional universities were created at Dartmouth and Lowell. By 1979 the public system included thirty institutions, enrolled 60% of all Massachusetts residents attending college within the state, and accounted for 45% of all students in colleges and universities in Massachusetts. The most rapid growth occurred during the 1960s, sustained by steadily expanding pressure for admission, a supportive political environment in both state and nation, and minimum opposition from the state's powerful independent institutions, which had all the enrollments they needed. Since the early 1970s, however, as pressures for admission have receded, political support also has eroded and enrollment growth, though continued, has been slower. While appropriations for higher education have continued to expand in recent years, they have represented a steadily declining percentage of the state budget and, after inflation, public support per full time student actually declined by 15% during the 1970s.

The reduced tension between public and independent institutions that characterised the 1960s proved difficult to maintain in the environment of slackening demand and diminishing resources of the 1970s. In the early part of the decade the independent institutions initiated a campaign to win some form of direct state aid and also began to push for increased levels of tuition in public institutions so that public and independent colleges would compete on more equal footing for applications from state residents. In the mid 1970s an accommodation was reached between leaders of the two sectors: the independent leaders agreed to drop their effort to raise public tuition and public leaders agreed to stop opposing independent efforts to achieve state assistance. In recent years state appropriations for scholarships useable at independent institutions have expanded steadily, rising from less than $2.5 million in 1971 to $16.5 million in 1980.

The most recent attempt to assess the impact of educational developments in Massachusetts since 1965 on the availability of educational opportunities for Massachusetts residents was undertaken by the Sloan Commission in 1978. The Commission's staff report concluded that the goal of assuring residents from all income groups access to some form of higher education has been achieved, largely through the expansion of public higher education. The

state scholarship program, the Commission concluded, has remained too small, despite recent growth, to be a major factor in providing educational opportunities for state residents.

The expansion of educational opportunity in Massachusetts between 1960 and 1980 has been a major achievement of public policy. At the same time, there are a number of indications that the state has no reason to be complacent in this area. Specifically:

- Massachusetts is not as successful as most other states in enrolling our own full-time residents in our educational programs. In 1979 only 16 states enrolled a smaller percentage of their own college-going residents than Massachusetts; New York, a major exporter of students, actually enrolls a higher percentage than does Massachusetts of its own residents attending college on a full-time basis. While our record in this respect reflects a general northeastern pattern—we are tied with Pennsylvania for second place, after New York, among eleven northeastern states in educating our own full-time residents—for no other state is higher education such a vital activity. 58% of the students we export attend college in one of the other five New England states or New York; 38% attend public institutions and 62% attend independent colleges or universities.

- According to census data from the middle 1970s compiled by the Sloan Commission, residents of Massachusetts between the ages of 18 and 24 who are dependent for financial support on their families are less likely, at almost every income level, to attend some form of college or university than their counterparts nationally.

- The Sloan Commission emphasized the fact that the range of institutions accessible to many of our low and moderate income residents is highly restricted. For many, attending any institution other than a public community college requires financial aid from the institution or more-than-normal student or parental contributions. Attending a private college poses significant financial problems for most state residents. According to the Commission, a student would need to come from a family earning more than $33,000. per year to attend even the least expensive private schools without financial aid.

It seems fair to conclude that the expansion of public support for higher education in Massachusetts in the 1960s, while substantial, left the state behind many other areas of the country in assuring educational opportunities for its residents. In recent years, as political support

for higher education has declined, the relative gains of the period of expansion have begun to slip away. In 1979 we ranked 50th in state expenditures per capita on higher education and 47th in expenditures per full-time student in public institutions; the comparable rankings in 1973 were 49th and 34th. We now rank 16th in state scholarship aid per capita; in 1973 we ranked 11th.

As state officials debate levels of public support for higher education in the 1980s, one final fact about higher education in Massachusetts should be emphasized: the complete absence of reliable information about likely demand for admission to public colleges in the years ahead. The most current set of enrollment projections published by any state agency was done in 1975 by the Board of Higher Education. These projections have been subject to severe criticism by educational planners, and they have proved to be quite inaccurate in anticipating actual enrollments for the late 1970s. For example, the 1975 projections were too high in their estimates of full-time undergraduates for 1979 and 1980 by 13,000 and 16,000 students. These projections were much more wrong for independent institutions than for public colleges and universities and much more wrong for full-time students than for all students. Since the 1975 projections were made, moreover, the 1980 census has been completed. Ten years ago 1970 census data resulted in a radical revision of expectations about demand for higher education in Massachusetts. Despite the limited usefulness of the 1975 projections, and the availability of new census data, there is currently no effort under way to develop new enrollment projections for the Commonwealth.

G. Organization of Public Higher Education

The 1965 report of the Willis-Harrington Commission, like the reports of many commissions that preceded it over the years, placed major emphasis on achieving coherence within public higher education. To achieve this, the Commission proposed to legislate mandates for various types of public institutions—community colleges, state colleges, universities—and to establish a statewide Board of Higher Education (BHE) to assure the rational development of the public system. The drafting and enactment of these provisions was attended by such intense maneuvering by the institutions, however, that the legislated mandates became increasingly vague and the new Board's authority was progressively contracted. To make matters worse, the new Board of Higher Education, lacking a constituency of its own, was never able to win sufficient support from the legislature to do an effective job of coordination. From the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s questions of mission and scale for institutions within the public system were determined—within very broad limits—more by the year-to-year political effectiveness of institutional leaders than by coordinated public policy. By the mid-1970s policy makers were looking for an alternative to the Board of Higher Education. In 1974, as part of a general reorganization of state government, Governor Sargent created an Executive Office of Educational Affairs, with a broad mandate to coordinate educational activities in the state. The inevitable

competition that quickly developed between the Secretary's Office and the BHE only added to the organizational confusion within higher education. Between 1974 and 1978 Governor Dukakis attempted to strengthen the Secretary's office at the expense of the BHE, in part to gain greater control over the activities of the public institutions than the BHE had been able to achieve.

A major problem with all efforts to coordinate the state's system of higher education has always been that so many institutions that play crucial educational roles are independent and beyond state control. These institutions, moreover, traditionally have been active in protecting their interests through the political system where, unlike the case in most other states, they frequently have had more influence than their public counterparts. Since 1969 the independent institutions have been formally organized through the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts (AICUM). In recognition of the educational and political importance of independent institutions in Massachusetts, officials from both public and independent sectors, have made efforts over the years to establish organizational frameworks within which the activities of the two sectors might be coordinated to some degree. The mid-1970's, a time of high tension between public and independent institutions, witnessed a series of such activities and produced at least one important agreement, described in the proceding section (page 20). One of the most important efforts at public-independent cooperations was launched in 1974 through the Board of Higher Education and led to the establishment of a "public/private forum" through which, it was hoped, leaders from both sectors would negotiate rational accommodations on major policy questions. The results of this enterprise proved the difficulties of achieving coordination within a voluntary system; despite honest efforts on both sides, leaders from the two sectors proved unable to make sufficient concessions on their competing agendas for significant progress to be made. The public/private forum fell apart.

The disarray within the public system and the failure of public-independent cooperation prompted, in the middle 1970s, a series of efforts to reorganize higher education through legislation. These activities, however, tended more to illustrate than to solve the state's problems in achieving a rational system of higher education. The legislature had a bill. The governor had a bill. The BHE had a bill. Institutions were inclined to work for one proposal or another depending on their perception of their own interests. The result was a stalemate. In 1977 the General Court created a new commission under Senator Boverini, to study the reorganization of higher education in the state. The Boverini Commission, however, was never able to assert a strong role for itself, and after the 1978 election its position eroded even further. The long drama of "reorg" was finally ended in 1980 when the legislature, for reasons of its own and without hearings or systematic study, adopted a sweeping reorganization of public higher education by means of an outside section of the budget. Legislative proponents of reorganization defended the irregular process on the ground that educational leaders had shown themselves completely unable, through any form of public process, to agree on an effective form of coordination for higher education in the state. It was hard to quarrel with this proposition.

The reorganization enacted by the legislature wiped out the governing boards of the state and community colleges, the Board of Higher Education and the Executive Office of Educational Affairs, and placed most significant powers over public higher education in the hands of a new Board of Regents. The theory of the legislation was that a reasonable system of higher education could be achieved only through a radical centralization of power, and the legislation establishing the Regents also charged the Board with developing a new master plan for public higher education. In principal, the legislature's effort to depoliticize educational policy through centralization could work, but results so far raise the fear that we have merely traded one form of politicization for another. The Regents have not been given the resources to carry out their mandate; an initial budget request for FY82 of $2.1 million was successively scaled down to an appropriation of $1.1 million, only marginally higher, after inflation, than the last full-year budget of the Board of Higher Education. Moreover—and even more troubling—the legislature, having created a Board with the statutory authority to rationalize public higher education, has continued to assert its own ideas about reorganization through the budget process; the FY82 budget proposed by the legislature forced the merger or elimination of specific institutions and attempted to eliminate the President's Office of the University of Massachusetts.

One casualty of the protracted maneuvering over institutional roles and organizational structures during the late 1960s and 1970s was any progress of a conceptual nature about how best to provide for the education of Massachusetts citizens through the existing array of public and independent institutions. The BHE, as part of its effort to create a public-private forum, sponsored an attempt to think through a sensible division of resources and missions between the sectors and among the institutions. A related effort was initiated by the Massachusetts Advisory Commission on Education (MACE) at about the same time. Both activities involved serious and sustained work by intelligent people but there was no entity and no political process capable of making effective use of this work. Reorganization, everyone ultimately concluded, had to come first. Now higher education is reorganized, and the Board of Regents is about to launch a new effort to create a master plan for higher education. Is there reason to be hopeful that the new Board can succeed where the Harrington Commission, the BHE, the Executive Office of Educational Affairs, and countless other commissions and committees over the years have failed? The resources that the Regents have been provided and the political pressures to which they have been subjected make one doubtful. Can anything be done to help assure a successful and sensible outcome for this latest effort to rationalize higher education in Massachusetts?

It is tempting to try to offer the Regents new ideas about possible forms of organization or institutional missions; but higher education in Massachusetts never has been short on bright ideas. The chief obstacles to establishing a more effective system of higher education have always been political, not conceptual or even organizational, and until there exists a coalition of political forces able to agree on an intelligent conception of public higher education and strong enough to bring about its implementation, intelligent ideas will not carry us very far.

The reorganization that established the Regents solved one political problem—fragmentation of authority within public higher education—but it created another—an enhanced ability of legislative and executive branch officials to influence higher education through a single source of authority. We have already witnessed the political implications of this for the rational development of public policy. Moreover, the new reorganization leaves two major political issues unaddressed. The first is the basic weakness of public education in Massachusetts, arising from its historical underdevelopment, its relative lack of a large, well-situated alumni body, and public attitudes which have tended toward skepticism about the value and quality of the enterprise. These factors render public higher education weak in terms of capacity to defend itself through aroused public support against swift changes in legislative mood; nothing could demonstrate this basic weakness more clearly than the way in which the recent reorganization of public higher education was carried out, a development impossible to imagine in almost any other state. A second major gap in the political structure of the Regent's master planning effort involves the absence of a clear way of relating public and independent institutions and concerns. Leaders of the independent sector, if they chose to do so, could almost certainly provide the Regents with important assistance in working toward a new conception of higher education for the state.

The Alden Seminars should consider whether the time has come to create a new coalition to support and strengthen higher education, public and independent, in Massachusetts. The state's most pressing concerns with respect to higher education must be the maintenance of strong national positions in education and research, discussed in preceding sections, and the maintenance of an array of institutions that can complement the state's economic structure. Without the former, Massachusetts could become just another left behind, de-industrialized, northeastern state; without the latter, individual citizens cannot be provided with opportunities for personal advancement that must be a central concern of public policy with respect to education. There are, within the framework implied by these concerns, strong roles for both public and independent institutions. These concerns, moreover, invite the attention not only of educators but of business and civic leaders. In the absence of a broad-based coalition ready to develop and support coherent public policies related to higher education it seems unlikely that the current effort to develop a comprehensive plan for higher education can achieve more than limited success. Massachusetts still needs to answer a basic question about itself: what kind of publicly supported program of higher education is the broad community of the state-and not just a particular group of political leaders and public educators in a particular season-ready to sustain over an extended period?

* * * * *

The 1980s will be a period of difficulty for institutions of higher education in Massachusetts, but it can also be a time of renewal. We have the base of strong institutions, in both the independent and public sectors, to maintain for succeeding generations the national prominence in higher education won by those who preceded us in positions of leadership. Historically,

important advances have been made by the Commonwealth as creative responses to adverse conditions. What is required of us is the same thing that was required of those who built our great institutions; boldness in the face of difficulty; tenacity in the pursuit of our goals; and a refusal to become mired in the petty politics that always surround and endanger any significant new enterprise.

Appendix

Overview of Massachusetts Higher Education

The Institutions*

The United States Department of Education lists 116 institutions of postsecondary education in Massachusetts in its Education Directory for 1979-1980. Of these, 30** are state institutions. Postsecondary enrollment listed in the directory shows the following institutional profile:

Enrollments	Number of non-state institutions	Number of state institutions
0 - 1,000	44	3
1,001 - 2,500	21	4
2,501 - 5,000	14	8
5,001 - 10,000	3	12
10,001 - 25,000	2	3
25,001+	2	0
	86	30

The forty-four institutions with enrollments of less than 1,000 are predominately junior colleges and professional (e.g.s. seminary, conservatory, optometry, etc.) institutions—only 9 are 4-year baccalaureate colleges. Together, the enrollments of the 44 come to 21,380—less than that of any of the three largest: Northeastern Univeristy, Boston University, or U/Mass-Amherst. The 3 state institutions enrolling less than 1,000 are Roxbury Community College and 2 professional schools, the U/Mass Medical Center at Worcester, and the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

Twenty-two institutions, those enrolling more than 5,000 students, represent 63.5 percent of the total state enrollment of 379,965. Of these larger institutions, seven are independent and fifteen are state institutions. Among the twenty-two, the public sector enrollment (122,086) is slightly greater than the independent enrollment (119,432). Tuition at these seven private institutions averaged $4,816 while tuition at the fifteen public institutions averaged $613.

*Excerpted from "A Brief Overview of Massachusetts Higher Education," by Wilson Pile.

**The Directory identifies the three campuses of the University of Massachusetts as three separate institutions.

The Independent Colleges and Universities*

The 1636 establishment of Harvard College as the first U.S. college also marked the beginning of independent higher education in Massachusetts. The succeeding 350 years have seen this educational enterprise grow to a total of 79 institutions, spread broadly across the Commonwealth, with 220,000 students. The independent schools and their students have had an influence that may be more important than in any other state. Stafford and Lustberg (1979) summarize the situation as follows:

> With only 0.2 percent of the nation's land and about three percent of the population, (Massachusetts) ranks eighth nationally in terms of total college enrollment. Because of the quality, diversity, and national reputation of its many private institutions, the state ranks first nationally in terms of the percentage of students attending private colleges and universities. Thus, while only about one in four full-time students in the nation attend private institutions, more than half of the students in Massachusetts enroll in the private sector.

About three in every five college students in Massachusetts attend independent colleges. In the academic year ending June 1979, total student enrollment in all Massachusetts institutions of higher education reached 376,000 students, of which 220,000 (59%) were in independent institutions (207,000) or 55%, were in AICUM institutions. Of the 220,000 students in independent colleges and universities, about 60% came from outside the Commonwealth; 154,000 were full-time; 65,000 were part-time. About 75% of the part-time students were from Massachusetts, compared with 52% of the full-time students. It is worth noting, however, that the percentage of Massachusetts students varies substantially from school to school; some draw their students primarily from their local area while the great majority of matriculants in others come from other states and countries.

The independent colleges and universities benefit the region culturally, as generators of ideas, and as providers of educational opportunity. Their activities provide diversity and instruction; their scholars confer distinction on the Commonwealth; and they enrich the life of our cities and towns in innumerable ways. These institutions also bring major economic benefits to Massachusetts. The schools had over 72,000 employees in 1979 with total salaries amounting to $838 million. Counting direct and indirect monetary effects, the schools contributed about $2.3 billion to Massachusetts personal income (4.4% of the total) and raised total employment by about 132,000 (5.2% of the total).

---

*Excerpted from "The Economic Impact of Higher Education in Massachusetts" by Lawrence Olson and Zofia Mucha.

The Public Colleges and Universities*

In 1979 in Massachusetts, public higher education is:

30 Institutions: 5 universities
10 state colleges and
15 community colleges.

In Massachusetts, public higher education costs the average student:

$2,703 to attend the average Community College

$3,000 to attend the average State College

Over $4,000 to attend the average University

*Excerpted from "Higher Education in Massachusetts" by the Executive Office of Educational Affairs

$315 million in FY80 in state dollars alone plus countless more dollars spent through trust funds, federal grants, etc.

Only 5.6¢ of the FY80 state budget. It was 7.6¢ as recently as FY73.

Exhibiting a 15% decrease in real appropriation per FTE Student over the last ten years.

Spending 8% of every dollar on fuel vs. only 3% ten years ago.

165,000 total students in 1978, including full and part-time graduate and undergraduate students. 45% of the total students in Massachusetts

Over 70,000 Continuing Education students per year.

Over 60% of Massachusetts resident students are attending public higher education.

25,000 total graduates in 1978.

Over $4,500 in increased income for every male college graduate, over $3,200 for every female

$ 100,000,000 in extra yearly income for the graduates of public higher education in any one year. Approximately 47% of recent graduates from U/Mass. stay in Massachusetts, a higher percentage from the State and Community Colleges.

Economic impact amounting to almost a 3 to 1 multiplier on the regional and state economy.

In Massachusetts public higher education is supported at a level:

51st out of 51 states in State and Local Appropriations to public higher education as a percentage of revenue.

50th out of 51 states in State and Local Appropriations to public higher education per Capita.

47th out of 51 states in State and Local Appropriations to public higher education per FTE Student

Is 42% below the norm in tax support for higher education in general, both public and private.

Reporter's Remarks

In the course of the first session, the participants divided into three groups of equal size to maximize opportunity for individual contribution to the deliberations. After an hour of small group deliberation the seminar reconvened. Reports of the small group deliberations were then delivered to the seminar as a whole. Here follows excerpts from these reports.

Group A

John Chandler, Discussion Leader
Joseph Healty, Reporter
John Brooks
Robert Cushman
Robert Corrigan
Frank Tredinnick

Report of Joseph Healey

We had a very intelligent, cooperative and disputatious group. Our results are the following thoughts:

Overall, both the private and the public sectors should have more effective legislative impact. Education is not the sexy subject it was in the 60s and early 70's, and the legislative leadership is not as educationally oriented as it was then. Accordingly public and private should be together on the issues, and we strongly support more effective impact.

We should strengthen the power of the Board of Regents. There's a feeling that more central planning is needed—not like New York State, for example, with rigid control and direction. But planning which enhances diversity. The public sector, with its whole set of different institutions and missions, needs to encourage diversity and needs greater centralized planning. The budget they have been given is absolutely minimal in terms of accomplishing their objectives.

While it is not the responsibility of either the private or public sector to train actual or future employees, there should be greater awareness of and cooperation with the business sector. In technical areas in particular, a stronger commitment is needed on the part of both sectors, if we are going to meet the challenges facing this state and nation from the standpoints of economic health and world leadership.

We agree with the concept of universal opportunity of access, but that does not mean automatic access at the college or university level. It is not necessarily the responsibility of private or public colleges or universities to make up for deficiencies in earlier educational levels. We are concerned about the decline of federal support—the curtailment of student loan and grant programs—more than a state issue, but a major concern.

Our last point is that the problem we all face is not necessarily survival, but the threat of self-delusion—the idea that, with fewer resources to depend on—regardless of source—we all try to do too much with too little, and the whole system will lose the pristine qualities which made it so attractive.

Group B

James Amsler, Discussion Leader
Avram Goldberg, Reporter
George Hazzard
Robert Wood
Carl Gilbert
Edward Phillips
Dorothy Marshall

Report of Avram Goldberg

I think it's fair to say that we were a hard-hitting and confrontation-orientated group, motivated by a unity of purpose that was quite inspiring.

An issue familiar to all was the tremendous role of the private institutions and the economic significance of higher education to the state and at the same time the tremendous failure of the legislature to recognize this. The result has been counter-productive competition between the private and the public sector, and an image problem for the public sector. It seems clear that the general public's perception of higher education is somewhat distorted—skewed by the image of the prestigious private institutions—and a public recognition of the value of diversity is needed perhaps, before you can have a climate for correct and productive planning.

We looked at other states and concluded that the concept of a highly centralized, elitist—in the best sense, perhaps, strong Board of Regents, even if it were desirable, is not likely to happen in Massachusetts. We should, however, bend slightly in that direction, to the end that an intense and long planning process is needed to improve the image of higher education.

A possible role for this group would be to foster the public image of the importance of higher education. The seminar is more noted by institutions, private in particular, who are not represented as it is by those who are. The challenge is two part - can a technique be developed to motivate the private sector to participate in joint process with the public sector, and, simultaneously, develop safeguards against the real dangers of political interference and control, not only with the public sector but with the private sector.

Concern was expressed over issues of quality - we must not make urban kids scapegoats, but maintaining academic standards in higher education foster standards in secondary schools. Concern was also expressed over the possible change in the role of admissions departments from screening to student procurement.

The issue of career preparation was resolved in part with a general concurrence that it is not the role of higher education to prepare machinists or teaching secondary school students basic reading and writing, but that there is a need for higher education to focus on the needs of the community. Is the present orientation local enough? Perhaps a group such as this could focus on bringing together public and private institutions to plan their orientation and responsibilities to the local community.

Concern was expressed over the validity and availability of useful statistics for planning for higher education. This led to a discussion on the role of the Regents. It was felt unanimously that they can play a very important role - not as czars like New York State - and that they need assistance in getting money and assistance in developing public support and public perception of their value.

Group C

Elizabeth Kennan, Discussion Leader
Herbert Roth, Reporter
Harold Miller
Roderick MacDougall
Kenneth Ryder
Harold Shively
Franklin Patterson

Report of Herbert Roth

Our group worked to develop an agenda for action for higher education. In developing this agenda, it was felt that it was necessary to develop public/private consensus on the important issues facing higher education.

Issues to be addressed include environmental factors and demographic factors. Yet there are more fundamental issues: what are the relative

priorities of higher education versus secondary education? To what degree should higher education be responsible for providing specific career skills? Is higher education in competition with CETA and similar programs? Is it a trade school, a research center, or a business? Can it be orchestrated so that higher education requirements are satisfied as well as the needs of the community in general and the business community in specific?

Finance was another concern. Who will champion the needs of higher education in the legislative process? Fiscal autonomy should be a primary agenda item, and, when resolved, we should proceed to the mechanics of satisfying financial need. The private sector has a great stake in what the Board of Regents does in this arena and in how they program the activities of the public institutions and in how they provide good fiscal management of their resources.

We noted the absence of politicians in the initial group, and expressed the hope that they will be involved in the process before they are presented with a program alien to them. They should be part of the solution. Eventually they should be presented with a solution that they have had an important part in developing.

Brief Biographies
of the Participants

JAMES T. AMSLER

James T. Amsler is President of Salem State College. He has also served as President of North Adams State College and as Associate Director of the Division of Massachusetts State Colleges.

JOHN E. BROOKS

John E. Brooks, S.J., is President of the College of the Holy Cross, where he previously served as Vice President and Academic Dean. A graduate of the College of the Holy Cross, he also attended Boston College and Gregorian University.

JOHN W. CHANDLER

John W. Chandler became President of Williams College in 1973. Prior to that he served as President of Hamilton College. He is Chairman of the Executive Committee of A.I.C.U.M. and has served as President of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.

ROBERT A. CORRIGAN

Robert A. Corrigan has been Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts at Boston since 1979. Previously he had been a Provost at the University of Maryland and before that Dean of Arts and Sciences at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. A graduate of Brown University and the University of Pennsylvania, he has been a member of the faculty of Bryn Mawr College, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Iowa and the University of Gothenburg in Sweden.

ROBERT CUSHMAN

Robert Cushman is Chairman of the Board of the Norton Company where he served as President and Chief Executive Officer. A graduate of Dartmouth, he has served as an overseer of The Amos Tuck School of Business Administration, among his many civic and business activities. He presently serves on the Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education.

CARL GILBERT

Carl Gilbert is in his eighth year as President of A.I.C.U.M. After graduating from Harvard Law School he joined the firm now called Ropes and Gray. He then joined Gillette as Treasurer and then became President and Chief Executive Officer. He has been a trustee of Tufts University for many years.

AVRAM J. GOLDBERG

Avram J. Goldberg is President and Chief Executive Officer of The Stop and Shop Companies. He also serves as an associate Trustee of Boston College, as a Fellow of The American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and as a member of the Corporation of the Boston Museum of Science. He is a Director of the Executive Board of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce.

GEORGE W. HAZZARD

George W. Hazzard is President Emeritus of Worcester Polytechnic Institute. He is presently serving on the Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education and is a Director of Project QUILL (Quality in Liberal Learning) and Project MAP (Minority Achievement Program) for the Association of American Colleges.

JOSEPH P. HEALEY

Joseph P. Healey, counsel to the law firm of Nasson and Hoban, served as President and Chairman of the Board of Bay Bank Middlesex. He has also served as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Massachusetts and as a member of the faculty at Boston College Law School.

JACOB HIATT

Jacob Hiatt, President of Rand-Whitney Corporation, is a graduate of the University of Lithuania and Clark University. He serves as a Trustee of Brandeis University, of the College of the Holy Cross, of the Tri-College Board, and as a Life Trustee of Clark University.

ELIZABETH KENNAN

Elizabeth Kennan has served as President of Mount Holyoke College since 1978. Before that she served as an Associate Professor of History of Catholic University of America where she was Director of the Medieval and Byzantine Studies Program. She serves on the Council on Foreign Relations and is Chairman of the Commission on Governmental Relations of the American Council on Education.

DAVID C. KNAPP

David C. Knapp has been the President of the University of Massachusetts system since 1978. Prior to that he served as Profost of Cornell University. He has also served as Dean of the New York State College of Human Ecology at Cornell and as Director of the Institute of College and University Administrators of the American Council on Education.

RODERICK M. MACDOUGALL

Roderick M. MacDougall serves as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Bank of New England Corporation and the Bank of New England. A graduate of Harvard, his educational activities include service as a trustee of Northeastern, member of the Corporation of Babson, and former President of Tri-Lateral Council for Quality Education.

DOROTHY MARSHALL

Dorothy Marshall is a Commonwealth Professor emeritus at U/Mass Boston. Her academic fields of interest are Political Science-Latin America, and Spanish. She is a former trustee of Holy Cross College, a former trustee and Chairman of the Board of Smith College, currently serves as trustee of Bryn Mawr College, Charlestown Savings Bank, the Ford Foundation, Pan American Society of New England and Northfield/Mt. Herman School.

HAROLD T. MILLER

Harold T. Miller is Chairman, President, and Chief Executive Officer of Houghton Mifflin Company, a Boston-based publishing firm. He is a trustee of Franklin and Marshall College and Babson College, and a council member of the American Antiquarian Society. Mr. Miller is also a director of the New England Merchants National Bank and its holding compnay, New England Merchants Company, Inc., and SCA Services, Inc.

COLEMAN M. MOCKLER, JR.

Mr. Mockler is Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of the Gillette Company. He is also a director of First National Boston Corporation, the First National Bank of Boston, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company, Raytheon Company and Fabreeka Products Company, as well as Chairman of the Corporation of Simmons College.

FRANKLIN PATTERSON

Franklin Patterson is the Director of the Center for Policy Studies and Boyden Professor of the University at U/Mass-Boston. A political scientist, he has taught at NYU, Tufts, Hampshire, and the University of Massachusetts. He directed the Lincoln Filene Center at Tufts, was the founding President of Hampshire 1966-71, and Board Chairman there 1971-74, and has served several educational institutions as trustee. A former secretary of the University of Massachusetts, he was interim president of that institution in 1978.

DAVID B. PERINI

David B. Perini is Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer of Perini Corporation. He is a graduate of Holy Cross College and Boston College Law School. He serves as a Trustee of Holy Cross and is a member of the Boards of State Street Boston Corporation, the Boston Council, Boy Scouts of America, and a corporator of New England Deaconess Hospital and Wentworth Institute of Technology.

EDWARD E. PHILLIPS

Edward E. Phillips, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of the New England Mutual Life Insurance Company, is a graduate of Amherst College and Harvard Law School. He is a Trustee of Amherst College, The New England Aquarium and The New England Conservatory. He has also served on the State Board of Education.

HERBERT ROTH, JR.

Herbert Roth, Jr., is Chairman of the Board and President of LFE Corporation. Prior to his election as President he served as President of the Anelex Corporation. A graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, Mr. Roth is an Honorary Vice-President of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce.

KENNETH G. RYDER

Kenneth G. Ryder is the fourth President of Northeastern University. Prior to his election as President he served as Executive Vice-President. A graduate of Boston University, he has served as Chairman of the Executive Committee of A.I.C.U.M., as a member of the National Commission on Student Financial Assistance, as President of the National Committee of Urban Program Universities, and as Vice-Chairman of the National Commission for Cooperative Education.

HAROLD E. SHIVELY

Harold E. Shively is the founding President of Bunker Hill Community College in Boston, Massachusetts. He was also the founding President of North Shore Community College in Beverly, Massachusetts. An educational consultant, President Shively has worked with governments of many countries including Argentina, Venezuela, Israel, England, Surinam and Jamaica. He is Vice President of the Community Colleges Cooperative for International Development, Inc.

FRANK A. TREDINNICK, JR.

Frank A. Tredinnick, Jr., Executive Director of A.I.C.U.M., is in his 28th year as a teacher or administrator in higher education. His many posts have included service as a Vice President of Simmons College, Vice President of Tufts University, and as the first Director of the New England College Fund. He also headed the Regional Accrediting Association and the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.

ROBERT C. WOOD

Robert C. Wood, a political economist, is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Massachusetts at Boston. Formerly he has served as Superintendent, Boston Public Schools; President, University of Massachusetts; and Undersecretary and Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. He is a Trustee of the College Board and Chairman of the 20th Century Fund Task Force on Federal Role in Public Education.

Guest Author

RICHARD FREELAND

Dr. Richard Freeland has been associated with the University of Massachusetts since 1970. He served as Dean of The College of Management and Professional Studies at the University of Massachusetts/Boston from 1974-79 and as Director of Education Planning for the Boston Campus from 1972-74. An American historian, Dr. Freeland published The Truman Doctrine and the Origins of McCarthyism in 1972. Since 1979 he has been on leave completing a study of the evolution of universities in Boston since World War II. Dr. Freeland received his BA from Amherst College in 1963 and his PhD from the University of Pennsylvania in 1969.